

**BOROUGH OF DUMONT
BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY
RENT LEVELING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 11, 2011**

Flag Salute

Meeting called to order at 7:07pm by Chairman Michael Falcone

SUNSHINE LAW: The notice requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act of the State of New Jersey have been satisfied by the inclusion of the date, time and place of this Rent Leveling Board meeting of the Borough of Dumont having been sent to *The Record*, the *Press Journal* and posted on the Borough website and in the Borough Hall on December 17, 2010.

ROLL CALL: Michael Falcone, Judy Parker, Coleman Szely, Albert Taxter, Irwin Buchheister-present; Lillian DeCristofaro-absent

Motion to approve Revised Minutes of March 21, 2011: Mr. Taxter

Second: Mr. Szely

All in favor: Aye

Motion passed

Motion to approve attorney invoice for March 2011: Ms. Parker

Second: Mr. Szely

All in favor: Aye

Motion passed

Mr. Falcone stated that the third item on the agenda, approval of Resolution 11-02, authorizing granting of Tenant Complaint will be tabled for now and we will go into Old Business from last month's meeting. He asked if everyone got a copy of the memo from Ms. Cho. As you can see, if you compare this to the minutes of last month's meeting, there are errors in the calculations. \$4,025.63 divided by 18 tenants divided by seven months does not equal \$22, it equals \$31.95. The calculation is all wrong. So if this is contested, which he intends to do, appeal it, we don't have a leg to stand on because the calculation is totally wrong, it does not come out to \$22. So if you read how it was calculated in the minutes, that presents a problem, we have to revisit this.

As Ms. Cho said in her memo, if you really want to go by the letter of the ordinance, the difference in the tenant's PSE&G bills is \$132.05. We talked about this at the last meeting and we all felt that there is an extra use of water, so we all decided we weren't going to go that high amount. Mr. Szely asked if we all decided that, he hasn't decided that, which is why he was reading the minutes; he stated he does not believe there is an excessive use of water and he wanted to point that out for the record. Mr. Falcone stated the bill is excessive; Mr. Szely agreed but stated we don't know why it is excessive. Mr. Falcone stated we do not know why the bill is excessive; we are assuming that it's the water because the bill changed when the water heater was installed. Mr. Szely stated to clarify for the record that he is not convinced there is an

excessive use of water. Mr. Falcone stated that if they didn't do anything else in her apartment except put the water meter in, that's the only thing that was done. Mr. Szely stated that the water meter may not be functioning properly, we have not looked at it. Ms. Parker stated there was an excessive bill prior to installation and the landlord was getting the bill. Ms. Parker stated that we are looking at the PSE&G bills from the landlord and then from the tenant; the landlord is not tampering with the bills and neither is the tenant so forget about what the landlord said, look at the bills from PSE&G. Mr. Szely stated that the wording would be appropriate if the majority opinion of the Board is that the water usage was excessive, if one person decided to dissent, then that's fine. Mr. Falcone asked how did the Board feel.

Mr. Taxter stated that first off he thinks that the figures are wrong because Ms. Cho has written down seven months for \$4,025. This is where he thinks we have a problem because that is August's bill; she had her hot water heater installed on September 3, so her final bill for her paying would be the August bill, so in this seven month period, you have got to add in September also to that figure. A discussion followed regarding page 11 of the March 21st minutes. Mr. Taxter said the problem is when we tallied up to get a price for the eight months, we took down from his PSE&G gas bill, but we have \$810 in electric bills also that he had to pay. If you take just the gas, it comes to \$4,000 and change. Ms. Parker stated that the gas also includes heat, so we have to try to pull out the heat number. Mr. Taxter said you can't pull out the heat number; we are trying to get an even number of 18 apartments, January through September. Ms. Parker said you have to pull out the heat number, Mr. Taxter stated no, he supplies heat, he supplies hot water, he supplies the lighting in the hallways and the front of the building, that is all included, so you have to add that in to break it down to come up with what he is saving by her having her own electric heater. Ms. Parker stated electric heater is used to heat the hot water so you are not taking into consideration gas heat to heat the apartment in the winter. You have to pull that number out. Mr. Taxter stated no, this figure only goes into September. The January bill came in February right down the line to September's bill in October. She had the water heater put in on September 3rd so her bill would start in October. So then you have to add the \$120 in for September that was on the landlord's bill, you have to add that in, the figures are not right. Mr. Falcone stated that was what we are trying to resolve. Mr. Taxter stated if you take all of his bills right down the line including the electric which he supplies, you go down to September, you come up with a figure, 18 into that, should come out to 20 some odd dollars, he doesn't know where the \$4000 came in, he said about \$4,000, he didn't come up with an exact figure when he came up with it. Mr. Falcone stated she came up with \$4,025 and Ms. Cho has all the bills. Ms. Parker stated that she took the tenant's electric bills.

Ms. Parker stated she is still confused about what you are talking about when you are using the landlord's bills. The landlord was using natural gas to heat the apartment and pay for hot water. These figures from the PSE&G statement for the landlord is giving her one figure for gas but that gas was used to provide heat for the apartment and also to heat the hot water. She stated that if she understands the law correctly, we are only supposed to give a tenant a credit for the hot water portion of water cost. Ms. Cho stated no, that is where the issue is. She stated that the way that the Dumont Rent Leveling Ordinance stands is that when the landlord provides the tenant with a service, regardless of what service it is, in this case it happens to be heat and hot water and then that service is subsequently taken away, whatever the average of the tenant's bill is afterwards should be reduced from her rent. Ms. Cho indicated to Ms. Parker that she is saying what she is

because she thinks the tenant's excessive use is in there so you think that is unfair. Ms. Parker said no, that is not what I am saying, what I am saying is you are lumping in, in that gas bill; the landlord is getting one gas bill which is for to heat the apartment plus paying the hot water. We have now extracted the hot water which now the tenant pays. Ms. Cho stated that the hot water is not being extracted, what's taking place is the landlord's entire heating bill, his PSE&G bill is being divided by eighteen just to get a rough average of how much does an average tenant in that building use. The reason that we are using her's is that we know what her individual bill is because she has her own PSE&G bill and in that electric, it includes not only her electric, but her heat and her hot water and everything. Ms. Parker asked if she had electric heat in her apartment. Mr. Falcone and Mr. Taxter both stated no. Mr. Falcone asked Ms. Cho if these bills are her's. She stated yes, so Mr. Falcone said forget the landlord, if you look at page two of Ms. Cho's memo; Ms. Parker said that it is the tenant's electric; Mr. Falcone stated from May, 2009. Mr. Coleman stated this is before her heater installation. Mr. Falcone stated that her average bills are \$22.53 a month. After they put the water heater in, it went up to \$154.58, so forget the landlord's bill. Ms. Parker asked how did you come up with the \$22.

Mr. Taxter stated that we are going all over the place and he doesn't think we have to go all over the place; I have it in here somewhere. We had the thing from PSE&G from the landlord showing what he paid in February which is January's bill; Ms. Parker said for gas, Mr. Taxter said and electric. Electric was not included in the figure from the minutes, that's what the problem is because that electric is for her house; it is for outside and for all the apartments. If you take the gas bill from February through September, you add them all up; this is what it costs the landlord to run eighteen apartments. Now he has put in a separate water heater for Ann. From October, November, December when her bills started jacking, that was her problem, no longer the landlord's problem, so our problem was is how do we get a reduction. We get the reduction by adding up the landlord's bills, January through October. Ms. Parker stated electric and gas. Mr. Taxter said yes, Ms. Parker stated why the electric. Mr. Taxter said because she needs her electric too. Ms. Parker stated she has her electric, hasn't she been paying her electric all along. Mr. Taxter said the electric bill is part of the landlord's scope of the whole building, that's the outside lights. Ms. Parker stated she just doesn't understand why you are including the gas heat; Mr. Falcone stated that is just making that figure \$4,000 and that is why her refund is so low, \$22.00. Mr. Taxter said yes and that's why it comes out to about \$22, \$23, if you take all the bills and break it down, that's what the landlord was paying. Mr. Szely stated he was paying for gas and electric, now he is paying for neither and Ms. Matula is paying for them. Mr. Buchheister stated he is also paying an electric for his portion and he has a gas bill for his portion; she has an electric bill for what she uses, Ms. Parker stated that she always had electric. Mr. Buchheister stated now the landlord put in a water heater which is heated by electric, it's on her bill so she has \$100 more than she had before, she is entitled to a reduction. Ms. Parker stated so hypothetically Ms. Matula can live in that apartment, 24 hours a day for the whole month, and if the electric bill came in on the last day of the month in the amount of \$765, does that now mean that she is entitled to free rent under Model #1-strict interpretation of the law; then the law needs to be changed. Mr. Falcone asked Ms. Parker if we go with the letter of the law and give her \$132, they will make an attempt to put her out, no doubt. Then another battle will start. If something is wrong with that electric meter or something going on in that apartment, it is going to be found out. Ms. Parker stated that she thought it would have been found out by now; she said they have had PSE&G out there several times. Mr. Falcone stated

that they couldn't have looked at this because this is absurd, this bill for a three room apartment. Ms. Cho stated that it is a studio apartment. Mr. Falcone stated that this just can't be and if nobody is willing to step up to the plate and find out why this bill is what it is; you can't just arbitrarily say it is because she is running the water. Ms. Parker asked then how do you explain the landlord's excessive gas and then the minute he pulled the tenant off, his went back to normal and now her's skyrocketed. That's gas versus electric, so it's two different commodities.

Mr. Taxter stated that you've got to go back, we are trying to figure out what it is costing the landlord every month for eighteen apartments and we have the gas and electric right here from January through to October, you break it down it comes to \$4,100, \$4,200 and if you break it down it comes to 20 something dollars, very close to what he had said. Whether people are eliminating the \$810, there are a lot of different scenarios, what you have to figure out is what did it cost the landlord to operate eighteen apartments for nine months. You take his electric bill, you take his gas bill, you add it up, you put eighteen into it and it comes to 20 something dollars. Now we get down to an issue, he put a hot water heater in Ann's place; she is going to be paying her own electric bill. Mr. Falcone asked so did the landlord's bill go down. Mr. Taxter stated that he does not care about his bill, what we are discussing here is Mrs. Matula's situation, how much of a deduction does she get in her rent. Say the landlord spent \$5,000 roughly, just guessing, if you break it down into eighteen apartments, you come up with a figure, it comes to 20 some odd dollars. Mr. Falcone stated that he can't come out with \$22 no matter how he does it.

Ms. Cho asked Mr. Taxter if he could explain how he is doing his calculation. Mr. Taxter stated here's the landlord's bill right here. January's bill came out in February for \$1278.77; the electric that month for the whole complex is \$107.78. Ms. Parker asked why he was including electric; Mr. Taxter stated because she lived there and he supplies electric. Ms. Parker stated not to her, she has her own electric. Mr. Taxter stated the bill has to still go, that is his expense running the complex. Mr. Taxter said then let's go with just the gas; the gas still comes out at about \$4000. The next one will be \$1212.35, \$725.94, \$316.84, \$256.25, \$126.84, \$108.84, \$120.08. The \$120.08 was the September bill that was for August. Mr. Falcone asked what the figure was before the \$1212, \$1278.77. Mr. Falcone asked is that eight months. Mr. Szely asked why we are having this discussion, we made the determination last meeting that it was going to be \$22. Ms. Parker stated to substantiate on how we arrived at that. Mr. Szely stated that should have ended it, he didn't realize we were going to have this discussion tonight on the same issue we debated for 1 1/2 hrs. last month. What we came up with was \$22 so why were they questioning that \$22. Ms. Parker and Mr. Taxter said they were going to appeal so we have to know for sure figure wise.

Ms. Cho stated that in putting together the resolution she wanted to make sure that the Board understood that whatever decision the Board comes up with so long as it is rational and follows some type of a fair or mathematical formula or something that is reasonable, it can be supported. So when you read the minutes from the last meeting, it sounded as if Mr. Taxter had taken the total of the landlord's PSE&G bills for eight months and then divided by eight to get an average cost per month. But, this does not come out to \$22 so she just wanted the record to be clear. Then it looked like what the Board said was what we should really do is compare the winter months to the winter months and the summer months to the summer months and everybody said

yes, that is what we should do but it wasn't done. Then, the Board Secretary stated she did do that and that she came up with \$22, but she had divided by 19 tenants, which was the wrong number of tenants. Yet, the Board said okay, let's go with \$22, so it didn't really seem to make sense. Mr. Szely stated that the \$22 is close enough, Ms. Cho said that the Board can't just say it is close enough. Mr. Szely said the landlord is going to appeal, which we already knew, so is he going to come up with another number. Mr. Falcone said he may come up with a different number but the Board can't justify our number. Ms. Cho stated that the landlord's number will likely say there is excessive usage so this is a situation that takes it out of the Rent Leveling Ordinance and no decrease should be given. She doubts that the Mayor and Council would uphold that type of decision and will probably look to the Board and say how did you come up with your number and that is what she is trying to get the Board to do. Mr. Szely stated the the landlord's position is that even though he put the meter in and she is now paying her own electric, he should not give her a reduction in her rent. Ms. Cho stated that is his position and she thinks that is not the way the ordinance reads. Ms. Parker stated she thought the landlord did a pass through, what he was doing was getting the lump sum bill for the entire complex, dividing by eighteen and passing through, so she was paying it all along but it was being absorbed by the eighteen tenants. Mr. Falcone asked how did he determine that out of the eighteen people, she was the one making the bills. Mr. Szely stated suppose you were paying \$800 a month and for that amount it covers utilities, it covers the other overhead expenses, now you are no longer paying for one of the elements of that bill. Ms. Cho stated she had paid for her own electricity all along but she didn't have her own separate hot water heater; she had all the heat and hot water that she wanted. Ms. Parker stated that she thought the landlord was doing a pass through, he would get the bills and then divide by eighteen and give each tenant a bill. Ms. Cho stated that the landlord was not doing a pass through as the landlord would get the bills and then pay the bills. Mr. Szely stated that the landlord was paying the hot water that was included in the rent, if she didn't get a bill, it was included in the rent, now she is paying for it separately, therefore, by logic she is entitled to a reduction in her rent.

Mr. Falcone stated that what we have to decide tonight is are we going to stay with the \$22 figure and if so, how do we justify it real simple so that we can sit with the Mayor and tell him within five minutes how we came up with \$22 or are with going to increase it. That is what we have to decide. Mr. Szely said he thought we came up with the number the last time he was here, he heard our discussion. Mr. Falcone stated that if he went back and went over the numbers like he did, he can't justify \$22 not based on the minutes. Mr. Falcone stated that if he gets a copy of the minutes and reads page 11, he is not going to come up with \$22. Mr. Szely stated that he has his own information; he could come up with his own calculations.

Ms. Cho stated there is no real black and white answer here. She thinks that the majority of the Board seems to have decided that a reduction is in order because that is what the ordinance says. Some of the Board feels there is excessive water usage that there needs to be some sort of allowance to be made so that the tenant doesn't get a windfall and that you are not sticking it to the landlord. The Board is trying to do something fair.

Mr. Falcone stated that if you look at Number 2, she takes \$132 and splits it, which gives the tenant \$66. Mr. Szely stated so you want to increase it from \$22 to \$66. Mr. Szely said that he would agree to that and would make a motion to it. Mr. Falcone stated you can justify that, it's

right here, very easy. Mr. Falcone asked if someone would second the motion. Ms. Matula asked if she could ask a question. Ms. Cho stated that the Board is in deliberations right now and that it was not the appropriate time to ask a question. Mr. Falcone stated we have a motion on the floor for \$66.03, does he have a second on that motion. Mr. Falcone stated that if we can't get a second on the motion, then we have to move on.

Example #2-Mr. Falcone stated that this seems to be a lot more confusing to explain. He likes Example #1 because it is very easy to explain. Mr. Falcone stated #2 is more complicated because we have cold months before installation, after installation, there is a month missing. Mr. Falcone stated #4 is too low in his opinion. Mr. Taxter asked \$31.95, Mr. Falcone stated no, Ms. Cho stated he is talking about the \$12.46. Mr. Buchheister stated that whatever figures you come up with you have to justify as to how you got it because the judge is going to say to you how did you come up with that number. You have to prove this is how we came up with the amount. Mr. Falcone stated that there are four people here tonight, one person made a motion, we have to come up with a second on the motion to vote on. Mr. Szely stated that he is withdrawing the motion because now we have a better one to vote on, the one for \$132. Mr. Falcone stated your motion was for the split the \$132 for \$66; Mr. Szely stated he is now withdrawing it. Mr. Szely stated he is trying to look for whatever additional expense Ms. Matula is incurring should be reduced from the rent. Mr. Buchheister stated that is the difference before and after the installation. Mr. Szely stated he is looking at it this way, if you are paying \$800 a month and now you have to pay x amount of dollars for a water bill, gas bill, electric bill, whatever you are paying for, that x should come out of what you are paying. Your living expenses should not exceed \$800. Mr. Falcone stated that for some reason the amount is excessive. Mr. Szely stated he understands that. Mr. Falcone stated we don't know why and the landlord is not stepping up to the plate to find out why, the landlord is just arbitrarily saying she is using that much water which to him is impossible. Mr. Falcone stated that because the amount is excessive, he is saying that we can split it and come up with \$66.03 which to him seems fair to both parties. Mr. Buchheister stated she will still be behind the eight ball, because her electric went up \$125, so even if you give her a \$60 reduction she still has to pay an additional \$60 on an electric bill because the landlord put an electric water heater in. Mr. Falcone asked if somebody wanted to make a motion for the \$132, if we get a motion for the \$132 is someone going to second it. Mr. Buchheister stated he felt she should get the difference between the before and after. Mr. Falcone asked if somebody would make a motion for that. Mr. Falcone stated to Mr. Szely we know what your opinion is; he then asked Mr. Taxter what his opinion was.

Mr. Taxter stated that he feels that is way too much money. Mr. Falcone asked you feel that \$66 is too much money. Mr. Taxter stated that we do not know what the situation is with that water heater, why the bills are so outrageous and we can't whack the landlord without being fair to both parties. Mr. Szely said you can't whack the landlord, the minutes say that he had two witnesses neither of whom we consider credible; he asked the landlord twice if he was going to install these heaters in every apartment, which he indicated he would, but he has no plan or timetable to do so, that's why he says he doesn't believe him. Ms. Parker stated she disagrees, if I were him seeing the hassle that he is going through right now, she would wait and when a tenant moves out, then she would put one in. Mr. Szely said but he didn't even say that, he kept saying I don't know, I don't know. Ms. Cho stated she would like to bring the Board to task. We have different Board members that have different opinions, which is fine, but the Board right

now is charged with looking at the borough ordinance and then making a decision as to whether the Board needs to follow that ordinance or to make some type of a deviation from that and make an exception based on the circumstances that are present in this case. Right now, Mr.

Buchheister stated that his opinion is that exactly the amount of the tenant's increase for services which we calculated at \$132.05, that is what should be deducted, unless a Board member is going to make a motion as to that recommendation, then she would recommend that the Board try to come up with an alternative number that the Board could agree on. Mr. Falcone stated that Mr. Buchheister doesn't vote, Ms. Cho agreed but stated he is a Board member and he can give his opinion and if there is a Board member who wants to make the motion as to \$132. Mr. Falcone stated we had a motion for \$66 but we couldn't get a second. Mr. Szely stated we had a motion for \$22 at the last meeting and he is going to appeal that. Ms. Cho stated that regardless of whether the landlord is going to appeal or not, that is not the Board's concern. Mr. Szely stated that if he is not happy with the \$22, do you think he wants us to go with the \$66 or \$132. Ms. Cho stated that whether or not the landlord decides to file an appeal, that is not what guides the Board in making a decision. The Board is guided by the Borough ordinance and to follow the laws of the State of New Jersey and to examine all of the evidence and do what they feel is fair and right. Mr. Szely asked why is the \$22 no longer justifiable. Ms. Cho stated the reason why she had asked the Board to revisit these numbers was if the Board wants to go with the \$22, then could the Board show the calculation as to how the \$22 was derived.

Ms. Cho stated to Mr. Taxter that she thinks that what he did was that he took eight months instead of seven months, February through September. Mr. Taxter stated that actually we have to go to nine. He said that in Example #3 where it breaks it down what the landlord paid for his gas and it comes out \$4,025.63 divided by 18 divided by 7 = \$31.95. Ms. Cho asked are you saying that instead of using 7 months, we use 8 months. He stated that actually September should be added in there because the water heater was put in in September and she didn't get her bill until October. So you have to take \$4,025.63 and add \$120.06 to it and it comes out to \$4,145.69, divided by 18 tenants. Ms. Cho added and then divided by 8. Mr. Taxter stated he is just going by the 18 tenants and that is what it cost the landlord to operate for the nine months up until her water heater was put in. Ms. Cho stated that if you divide that number by the 18 and then the 8 months, it comes out roughly to \$28.29 per tenant. Mr. Falcone stated that it is still not \$22. Mr. Taxter said he knows, if you look at my language in the minutes, I said about \$4,000 and I was just roughly speaking, I didn't throw out an exact amount. Mr. Szely stated that every number we come up with right now is higher than the \$22, so if he wants to appeal the \$22; Mr. Falcone stated that is not our problem. Ms. Cho stated that if we go with the \$22, there is no basis for that. If we go with the calculations we just did, it comes out to \$28.29. The landlord should really have lumped in the September bill because the bill was September 8th and the water heater was installed on September 3. If you want to take February through September, add that total up which comes out to \$4,145.69. If you divide that by 8 months and then divide that by 18 tenants, the average tenant's utility bill is \$28.29.

Mr. Taxter stated that he would make a motion that we go with that. Mr. Falcone stated for \$28.29; Mr. Taxter stated yes. Mr. Taxter said his feeling here is that looking at it overall, you don't want to kill anybody here, we just want to be fair and he thinks going through his gas bill for hot water, etc. for the nine months broken down comes out to \$28.29 and he thinks that is fair and he doesn't want to be giving no \$100 or \$200, he doesn't think it is fair to the landlord with

all the money he has put into the building. Mr. Falcone stated that is all hearsay, Mr. Taxter said yes, it is hearsay, but he says he has redone the kitchen and the apartment downstairs. Mr. Falcone stated he absolutely does not believe that the landlord did what he says he did. Mr. Taxter said that is a possibility too but this is basically what he came up with at the first meeting.

Mr. Falcone stated that he wants to state now on the recording on the minutes; "We revisited this issue tonight because the calculations were incorrect on the \$22. We had this discussion tonight because of the calculation. We recalculated everything the same way in which we came up with the \$22 and we came out with a new figure of \$28.29." Do we have a motion for \$28.29? Mr. Szely said make it an even \$28.

Motion to decrease the rent \$28 instead of the \$22 each month, and the reason being we had to add an extra month onto the tally so it came out to \$28.29: Mr. Szely
Second: Mr. Taxter

Ms. Cho stated that at the last meeting, there was an issue as to whether it was going to be retroactive to the date the water heater was installed.

Mr. Szely said that he is making the motion that it is retroactive to the date the heater was installed, September 3, 2011.

Mr. Falcone stated that the motion is \$28 per month retroactive to the day of the installation of the heater.

Do we have a second on the motion: Mr. Taxter
Roll call vote: Mr. Falcone, Mr. Taxter, Mr. Szely – yes
Ms. Parker – abstain
Motion passed.

Mr. Buchheister stated he had a question as to retroactive. Do we ask him to put the money in escrow instead of giving it back to the lady or keeping it himself. Mr. Falcone stated he asked the landlord to put it in escrow and he said he would not do it. Mr. Buchheister asked if we could put that in the motion, that the money retroactive shall be put in an escrow fund. Ms. Cho stated just like in superior court, when you sue somebody and get a money judgment, the decision is here that there is going to be a new rent and that it is retroactive, but how the parties go about collecting it, they have to use their own means for that. Now Ms. Matula continues to live there and she has to pay rent for next month; for example, one thing she can do is just take the order, give a copy of it to the landlord, and then deduct the amount that he owes her from her rent and that would just clear up the issue. We can't right now direct the landlord to give the money in escrow to the Board, that would be beyond the Board's jurisdiction.

Ms. Cho stated that in terms of the resolution she had prepared, nothing has changed, because of the decision the Board has made today, the decision is identical to the decision that came up last week with the exception that there was a calculation error. Does the Board just want to cross out the \$22 and insert \$28 so that it could be approved. A recess was taken to amend the resolution based on the decision made at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Falcone stated that we have a resolution now that we need to approve before we end the meeting. The changes to the resolution were read by Mr. Falcone. Three majority votes in the affirmative were recorded by Mr. Taxter, Mr. Szely and Mr. Falcone and one abstention from Ms. Parker. Mr. Falcone signed the resolution.

The next meeting of the Rent Leveling Board is scheduled for June 13, 2011.

Motion to adjourn: Mr. Taxter

Second: Ms. Parker

All in favor: Aye

Motion passed.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:40pm.

Kathy Schaefer
Rent Leveling Board Secretary